IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
APPELLATE SIDE.

WRIT PETITION NO. 8617 OF 2005.

The State of Maharashtra & ors. ... Petitioners.
V/s.
Smt. Laxmi H. Patil. ... Respondent.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.8621 OF 2005 OF 2005.

The State of Maharashtra & ors. ... Petitioners.
vs.
Smt. Mandabai A. Kadu .. Respondent.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 8666 OF 2005.

The State of Maharashtra & ors. ... Petitioners.
vs.
Smt. Kamlabai B. Kale. ... Respondent.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 8867 OF 2005.

The State of Maharashtra & ors. ...Petitioners
vs.
Laxman Krishna Dabade ..Respondent.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.8668 OF 2005.

The State of Maharashtra & ors. ..Petitioners.
vs.
Smt. Sarubai K. Dabade ..Respondent.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 8669 OF 2005.

The State of Maharashtra & ors. ..Petitioners.
vs.
Smt. Anusaya B. Ambavale ..Respondent.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 8670 OF 2005.

The State of Maharashtra & ors. ..Petitioners.

vs.

Smt. Kalabai D. Padwal. ..Respondents.

Shri D.A. Patil, AGP for the Petitioner.
Shri Rajiv L. Patil for the respondnets.

CORAM: V.C. DAGA,J.
DATE : 24.4.2006.

P.C. :

. Heard learned Counsel appearing for the petitioners.

2. There is delay of about 8 years in filing these petitions.

3. It is clear that the impugned order was passed on 5th November 1998. Inspite of repeated requests, the Forest Department did not implement the impugned order, with the result respondents were required to initiate action for non-compliance of the order of the Labour court.

4. The present petitions have been filed by the State on 17th November 2005.

5. These petitions can hardly be said to be bonafide petitions. Apart from this, the delay has also not been explained in the petitions. General vague explanation can hardly be said to be a substitute for explaning delay of about 8 years in

filing these petitions.

6. In the above view of the matter, no case is made out to entertain these petitions. The petitions are, accordingly dismissed on account of laches in limine with no order as to costs.

(V.C.DAGA,J.)